

REMARKS

The examiner's allowance of claims 4-6 is acknowledged.

The examiner has rejected independent claim 1 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The examiner indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the destination address" appearing in lines 9-10 of the claim. The undersigned has studied claim 1, and cannot understand the examiner's view that there is insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 1 reads as follows, with references to "destination address" underscored:

1. In a network of stations interconnected by a transmission medium, a method of operating at least first and second stations according to a media access control protocol comprises:
transmitting on the transmission medium at the first station a first frame transmission having a destination address corresponding to the second station;
receiving the first transmission at the second station;
transmitting on the transmission medium at the second station a second frame transmission including information from the first frame transmission other than the destination address, the information from the first frame transmission occupying fewer bits than the destination address but being sufficiently unique to the first frame transmission as to convey that the second frame transmission is a response to the first frame transmission; and
receiving the second frame transmission at the first station and determining that the second frame transmission is a response to the first frame transmission and indicative of receipt of the first frame transmission by the second station.

Clearly, the references to "the destination address" in the third element of the claim are references to the introduction of "a destination address" in the first element. As the claim explains, a first frame transmission having "a destination address corresponding to the second station" is transmitted on the transmission medium at the first station. After the first frame transmission is received at the second station, a second frame transmission is transmitted at the second station. The second frame transmission includes information from the first frame transmission "other than the destination address," and that information occupies fewer bits "than the destination address". Clearly, "the destination address" referred to twice in this later

paragraph of the claim is a reference back to "a destination address" introduced earlier in the claim.

A very similar use of "a destination address" followed by later references to "the destination address" is found in claim 4, which the examiner has allowed.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 are allowable over the art of record.

The examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned to discuss the matter if he continues to believe that there are antecedent basis problems in claim 1.

The remaining claims are all properly dependent on claims 1 and 4, and thus allowable therewith. Each of the dependent claims adds one or more further limitations that enhance patentability, but those limitations are not presently relied upon. For that reason, and not because applicants agree with the examiner, no rebuttal is offered to any reasons advanced by the examiner for rejecting the dependent claims.

Allowance of the application is requested.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/27/2008

/grogerlee/
G. Roger Lee
Reg. No. 28,963

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945